

REMARKS

Applicant submits this response further to the Office Action dated December 15, 2010.

The Examiner rejected claims 97-122, 125-131 for obviousness type double patenting.

Specifically, the rejections are as follows:

“ Claims 97-122, 125-131 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-61 of U.S. Patent No. 7,848,496 B2. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 97-122, 125-131 of the present invention are anticipated by claims 1-61 of the patent.

Claims 97-1 22, 125-131 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-168 of U.S. Patent No. 7,839,984. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 97-122, 125-131 of the present invention are anticipated by claims 1-61 of the patent.

Claims 97-122, 125-131 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-91 of U.S. Patent No. 7,835,509. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 97-122, 125-131 are anticipated by claims 1-91 of the patent.

Claims 97-122, 125-131 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-87 of U.S. Patent No. 7,835,508. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are

not patentably distinct from each other because claims 97-122, 125-131 are anticipated by claims 1-87 of the patent.

Claims 97-122, 125-131 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-195 of U.S. Patent No. 6,323,894. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 97-122, 125-131 are anticipated by claims 1-195 of the patent."

Although Applicant submits that the present claims are distinct from the claims of the prior patents, in order to conclude prosecution of the present application, terminal disclaimers with respect to Patent Nos. 7,848,496; 7,839,984; 7,835,509; 7,835,508; 6,323,894 are provided with this response.

Respectfully submitted,

BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C.

Dated: May 16, 2011

9229 Sunset Blvd., Suite 630
Los Angeles, CA 90069
(310) 247-2860

By: /Reena Kuyper/
Reena Kuyper
Registration No. 33,830